

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12, 18-35, and 41-45 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12, 18-35, and 41-45 stand rejected. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of the claims. In the event that the claims are not allowed, applicant respectfully requests an Advisory Action.

**Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Independent Claims 1 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,511,199 (Anthias, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,442,999 (Travis), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,957 (Ratner). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

Previously amended independent claim 1 requires, in part, determining a transport protocol at run-time for a message object based on destination information from an environment variable. The transport protocol could be a process-pathway protocol (similar to Ratner), or it could be an entirely different transport protocol such as a process to process protocol or a process to socket protocol. Anthias, Ratner, or Travis, separately or in combination do not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Specifically, none of the references teach or suggest determining a transport protocol at run-time. Additionally, determining the transport protocol at run-time based on destination information from an environment variable is not disclosed.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable in view of the prior art.

The office action states in paragraph 6 that neither Anthias nor Travis teach or suggest determining a protocol at run-time, but that Ratner does. While Ratner does disclose the Linkmon process that handles client-server interaction using run-time libraries, it is not clear from the discussion what the run-time libraries are used for. In other words, the use of run-time libraries by Ratner does not teach or suggest the limitation of determining a transport protocol at run-time based on destination information from an environment variable. In fact, the IPC protocol is the Inter-Process Communication (IPC) protocol, a high-level protocol for inter-process communications. The use in Ratner of IPC by itself does not imply that the system of Ratner determines a transport protocol at run time based on destination information from an environment variable.

As discussed in the applicant's previous response, Ratner discloses always using the "path" routing mechanism (Ratner, col. 6, lines 22-36). The path routing mechanism is used in Ratner to create dialogues (pathsends) between clients and servers to as to provide context to multiple client-server transactions. In Ratner, communications between client and server are managed by Linkmon (Ratner, col. 3, lines 17-22). The path constructed between the client and server is therefore also managed by Linkmon. The path between client and server is a transport protocol and the protocol is already determined prior to runtime. In contrast, claim 1 requires determining the transport protocol at run-time.

Independent claim 24 contains limitations similar to claim 1 and is therefore also allowable over the art of record. The remaining dependent claims contain limitations that render them separately allowable over the prior art. However, applicant forgoes such a discussion in the interest of brevity.

**CONCLUSION**

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4-16-05

**SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER**

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176  
Setter Ollila LLC  
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15  
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

**Correspondence address:****CUSTOMER NO. 28004**

Attn: Harley R. Ball  
6391 Sprint Parkway  
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100  
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100